CITY CENTRE SOUTH AND EAST AREA COMMITTEE 11 JUNE 2012.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS.

1. Application no. 12/00777/OUT.

Address. Land Behind 44-48 Greenhill Main Road.

# **Late Representations**

Following the submission of the ecological scoping survey, an additional representation has been received from a neighbour disputing the findings that the survey points out that there are no signs of badgers on the site. The representation provided a photo of a larger hole on the site, which is claimed to be used by badgers, and a photo of badgers in the rear garden of one of the houses on James Andrew Crescent, which the representation claims entered the garden from the application site.

In response to the representation, an additional site visit was made on 01<sup>st</sup> June 2012, to explore the holes pointed out by the neighbour. The majority of holes on site are similar to that identified in the Ecological report as not being large enough for badger use, although there is a hole on site which is larger than the others. All the holes do not exhibit spoil or any evidence of being in use by mammals, with vegetation covering the majority of the opening of the largest hole, which would not be in place should the hole be in use by badgers. No badger tracks or similar are visible on site.

A phone conversation with a representative from the South Yorkshire Badger Group was made on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2012, who confirmed that he had previously visited the site in May after responses from local residents and undertaken a search of the site for evidence of badgers. He had concluded that there was no evidence of badger setts on the site, nor any badger tracks.

The officer is aware from phone conversations with neighbours that there is a badger sett in the local area, but not within the application site. It is highly likely that the badgers viewed by the latest representation are from this site, and not coming from within the application site.

Following an additional site visit and correspondence from the South Yorkshire Badger Group (who have undertaken their own assessment of the site), it can be stated with a degree of confidence that there are no badger setts on the site, nor any badger routes that would be affected by the proposed development.

An additional representation has been received from CIIr Munn, objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:

- The proposal would split one of the few remaining thin strips of land forming original crofts, which are referred to in the Greenhill Conservation Area Appraisal, and detract from the historic character of Greenhill village.
- The land forms a garden and the NPPF should be taken into consideration.

The development will increase the noise and traffic.

These issues have already been assessed within the report and there is no change to the recommendation.

#### Additional Consultation.

With reference to fire safety, an additional consultation response has been received from South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue stating that , if a sprinkler system is fitted, then access in accordance with the guideline laid out in BS9991:2011, 23.2 would be acceptable. The access to this development does accord with this guidance. This complements the assessment on page 45 of the agenda that recommends that a condition requiring the use of a sprinkler system be used.

# Amendment to report.

On page 36 in para 4, there is reference to the application seeking specific approval for landscaping. This is not the case as landscaping is reserved for a future detailed application. The reference to landscaping is, therefore, deleted.

#### Amended Recommendation.

On page 30 of the report, it is stated that the application is recommended for Visit by the Planning Highways Area Board. This is incorrect, and the recommendation should read 'Grant Conditionally'.

# 2. Application no. 11/03524/OUT.

Address. Curtilage of 35 Greenhill Main Road and Meadowhead Avenue.

# **Late Representation**

An additional representation has been received from Cllr Munn, objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:

- The proposal would split one of the few remaining thin strips of land forming original crofts, which are referred to in the Greenhill Conservation Area Appraisal, and detract from the historic character of Greenhill village. This application erodes the scale of the croft behind one of the most important listed buildings in the village.
- The access to the site is limited in size.

Issues regarding the impact on the setting of the neighbouring Conservation Area and the access proposal are covered within the assessment report and there is no change to the recommendation.

#### Amendment to Impact on Wildlife.

This section of the report is set out on pages 61 and 62 of the agenda and it says that there is no evidence of protected species on the site. However, during the Members site visit, the recently created habitat of a protected species was clearly evident to the south of the application site so a further Ecological Survey will be required to evaluate this with possible remediation measures. This will be dealt with by an additional condition.

#### Additional Condition.

Prior to the commencement of development, a further Ecological Survey shall be carried out that will assess the presence of protected species within and around the site. The survey shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and any remediation measures required by the survey shall be incorporated into the development.

In the interests of nature conservation.

#### Additional Directive.

The applicant is advised that the Local Planning Authority expect the Reserved Matters submission to closely reflect the indicative scheme submitted as part of this outline application. A detailed scheme that is significantly larger in terms of scale and massing is unlikely to be acceptable.

# Amended Recommendation.

On page 48 of the report, it is stated that the application is recommended for Visit by the Planning Highways Area Board. This is incorrect, and the recommendation should read 'Grant Conditionally'.

# 3. Application no. 12/01335/FUL

# Address: The York, 243-247 Glossop Road

The applicant has requested that this application be deferred and considered at the next Committee meeting (2 July). The deferral is requested to enable the applicant to address Members personally rather than through the agent. The applicant has an unavoidable family commitment outside Sheffield which prevents him from attending this Committee meeting.

Deferral is at the discretion of the Chair.

This page is intentionally left blank